|    | Case 1:25-cv-00748-JLT-GSA Dod  | cument 12 | Filed 08/12/25     | Page 1 of 2                           |  |
|----|---|-----------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1  |   |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 2  |   |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 3  |   |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 4  |   |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 5  |   |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 6  |   |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 7  |   |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 9  | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 10 |   |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 11 | E.J. MCELROY, a.k.a. EIBON MCEI   | LROY,     | Case No. 1:25-cv-0 | 748 JLT GSA (PC)                      |  |
| 12 | a.k.a. LATWAHN MCELROY, a.k.a.<br>LATHWAHN MCELROY,   |           |                    | NG FINDINGS AND                       |  |
| 13 | Plaintiff,  |           |                    | TION TO PROCEED IN                    |  |
| 14 | v.  |           | PLAINTIFF TO PA    | S, AND DIRECTING<br>AY THE FILING FEE |  |
| 15 | SGT. GUZMAN, et al.,  |           | WITHIN 21 DAYS     |                                       |  |
| 16 | Defendants.   |           | (Docs. 2, 9)       |                                       |  |
| 17 |   |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 18 | Plaintiff asserts that he suffered violations of his civil rights while housed at Kern Valley           |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 19 | State Prison and seeks to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> in this action. (Docs. 1, 2.) The magistrate |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 20 | judge reviewed Plaintiff's litigation history and found Plaintiff had three actions dismissed for       |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 21 | reasons that qualified as strikes under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). (Doc. 9 at 4-5.) The magistrate judge      |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 22 | found Plaintiff does not allege facts supporting the conclusion that Plaintiff was imminent danger      |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 23 | of serious physical injury when he filed the action. (Id. at 5.) Therefore, the magistrate judge        |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 24 | recommended the Court deny the motion to proceed in forma pauperis and direct Plaintiff to pay          |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 25 | the filing fee. ( <i>Id.</i> at 6.)   |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 26 | The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on Plaintiff and notified him that                    |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 27 | any objections were due within 14 days. (Doc. 9 at 6.) The Court advised Plaintiff that "failure        |           |                    |                                       |  |
| 28 | to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of certain rights on appeal."     |           |                    |                                       |  |
|    |   | 1         |                    |                                       |  |

|    | Case 1:25-cv-00748-JLT-GSA Document 12 Filed 08/12/25 Page 2 of 2                                    |  |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1  | (Id., citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014).) Although the Court granted    |  |  |  |  |
| 2  | Plaintiff a 15-day extension of time on July 15, 2025 (Doc. 11), he did not file any objections, and |  |  |  |  |
| 3  | the time do so expired.  |  |  |  |  |
| 4  | According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a <i>de novo</i> review of the case.        |  |  |  |  |
| 5  | Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations           |  |  |  |  |
| 6  | are supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court <b>ORDERS</b> :                     |  |  |  |  |
| 7  | 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on July 15, 2025 (Doc. 9) are                             |  |  |  |  |
| 8  | ADOPTED in full.   |  |  |  |  |
| 9  | 2. Plaintiff's motion to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> (Doc. 2) is <b>DENIED</b> .                |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 3. Within 21 days following the date of service of this order, Plaintiff <b>SHALL</b> pay            |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | the \$405.00 filing fee in full to proceed with this action.   |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Failure to pay the required filing fee as ordered will result in the dismissal of this               |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | action without prejudice.  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | IT IS SO ORDERED.  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Dated: August 12, 2025  United: States District Judge  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |